



FEED THE FUTURE FEEDBACK PROJECT

ANNUAL REPORT, YEAR 3

Updated October 29, 2014; Revised and Finalized July 28, 2015
This report was produced by Westat for review by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Prepared for the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID Contract Number
GS-23F-8144H/AID-OAA-M-12-00006, Feed the Future FEEDBACK

Contact:
Detra Robinson, MA, PMP
Chief of Party
Westat
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: 301-738-3653
Email: DetraRobinson@westat.com

<u>Table of Contents</u>		<u>Page</u>
	ACRONYMS	v
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	PERFORMANCE MONITORING.....	2
	2.1 Collecting Baseline Assessments of Feed the Future Performance Monitoring Indicators	2
	2.2 Providing Additional Analyses of Baseline Data	5
	2.3 Support for Development of the Global Report	6
	2.4 Develop Materials to be Used for the Interim Indicator Assessments	6
	2.5 Launch the Interim Indicator Assessments.....	7
3	IMPACT EVALUATION.....	10
	3.1 Impact Evaluations	10
	3.2 Impact Evaluation Capacity Building	12
4	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT.....	12
	4.1 Introduction.....	12
	4.2 Status of the KM Milestones/Activities	12
	4.3 Summary of KM Activities and Accomplishments	15
5	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	16

Annexes

A	Performance Management Plan Achievements.....	17
B	Summaries of Feed the Future Baseline Surveys	24
B.1	NORTHERN KENYA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	25
B.2	MALAWI FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	26
B.3	NEPAL FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	27
B.4	RWANDA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING SUMMARY	28
B.5	TAJIKISTAN FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	29
B.6	UGANDA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	30
B.7	SENEGAL FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	31
B.8	ZAMBIA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY	32

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

C Summaries of Impact Evaluations Planned to Date 33

Tables

2-1 Baseline survey dataset submission dates 5
2-2 Projected timeline for fieldwork for the interim assessments in 2015 9
2-3 Status of preparatory activities for interim indicator assessments 9

ACRONYMS

BFS	Bureau for Food Security
DEC	Development Experience Clearinghouse
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
FTF	Feed the Future
FTFMS	Feed the Future Monitoring System
GPS	Global Positioning System
IE	Impact evaluation
IP	Implementing partner
IRB	Institutional Review Board
LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Survey
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MFD	Mission-focused districts (Uganda)
NLSS	Nepal Living Standards Survey
ODK	Open Data Kit
PBS	Population-based survey
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PRIME	Pastoralist Resilience Improvement and Market Expansion
REGAL	Resilience and Economic Growth in Arid Lands (Kenya)
UNC	University of North Carolina
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
ZOI	Zone of influence

1 INTRODUCTION

Feed the Future, the President's global hunger and food security initiative, seeks to sustainably reduce poverty, the root cause of hunger, raise the incomes of the rural poor, and reduce the number of children suffering from under-nutrition. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Bureau for Food Security (BFS) is responsible for leading the Government-wide effort to implement the Feed the Future initiative. The core investment areas of the initiative are women's empowerment, diet quality and diversification, post-harvest infrastructure, high-quality inputs, and financial services. The high-level target of the initiative is to reduce poverty by 20 percent and prevent stunting among children under age five by 20 percent in regions known as the zones of influence (ZOI) targeted by Feed the Future focus countries.

In May 2012, BFS awarded the five-year Feed the Future FEEDBACK (FTF FEEDBACK) contract to provide performance monitoring, impact evaluation, and knowledge management support to the initiative. The main objectives of the FTF FEEDBACK project are to (1) enable USAID Missions to meet Feed the Future performance monitoring requirements and maximize the use and benefits of the data collected; (2) provide high-quality empirical evidence to inform program design and investment decisions that will promote sustainable food security; (3) ensure timely availability of high-quality data for use in monitoring performance and evaluating impacts of Feed the Future; and (4) facilitate accountability and learning about what Feed the Future interventions work best, under what conditions, and at what cost.

FTF FEEDBACK is implemented by Westat in partnership with the University of North Carolina's Carolina Population Center (UNC), and TANGO International.

This report summarizes the activities and accomplishments of the third year of the FTF FEEDBACK contract. In order to align the contract with the government fiscal year, the first year of the contract was truncated to the four-month period of May 7, 2012 to September 30, 2012. Year 3, the period covered by this report, was from October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014.

FTF FEEDBACK organizes its work under five components: (1) performance monitoring; (2) impact evaluation; (3) knowledge management (which includes capacity building support for all impact evaluations); (4) project administration; and (5) data management. The last two components (project administration and data management) direct and support the three components that work to achieve FTF FEEDBACK's technical objectives. This report focuses on the three technical components: performance monitoring, impact evaluation, and knowledge management. These components are addressed in the sections that follow. FTF FEEDBACK progress in achieving the targets established for all five components in its Performance Management Plan are provided in Annex A.

2 PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The performance monitoring component primarily supports BFS in periodic monitoring of standard indicators to assess program performance and track the trajectory of change in these indicators. The original scope of work for the FTF FEEDBACK contract included provision of technical assistance and training on Feed the Future indicators, though this aspect of the contract was removed early in Year 3.

FTF FEEDBACK's activities under the performance monitoring component had five foci in Year 3: (1) completing work on the baseline assessment of performance monitoring indicators in nine countries; (2) providing additional analyses of baseline data at the request of BFS or the USAID Mission; (3) helping BFS consolidate information and document findings from all of the baseline indicator assessments in a Global Report; (4) helping BFS develop materials to be used on the interim indicator assessments; and (5) launching the interim indicator assessments in seven countries assigned to FTF FEEDBACK.

2.1 Completing Baseline Assessments of Feed the Future Performance Monitoring Indicators

Feed the Future supports activities in more than 30 countries, with intensive support provided in 19 focus countries. Among other things, Feed the Future is collecting, analyzing, and reporting baseline, and interim values for the following indicators¹ in these focus countries:

- Prevalence of poverty: percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day;
- Per capita expenditures of USG targeted beneficiaries;
- Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age;
- Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age;
- Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age;
- Prevalence of underweight women;
- Prevalence of anemia among children age 6-59 months
- Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age
- Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI);
- Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger;
- Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet;
- Women's dietary diversity: mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age; and
- Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age.

These data are captured through household surveys in the Feed the Future ZOIs. Data for some of these population-based indicators may already have been collected on other surveys such as a Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) or Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Where data have not been

¹ Prevalence of anemia among children age 6-59 months and among women of reproductive age was reported in the baseline assessment but is not being collected and reported in the interim assessment.

collected recently, or where the sample size was not large enough in the ZOI, the data have to be collected by a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) contractor through a large-scale population-based survey (PBS).

FTF FEEDBACK was given responsibility for the baseline indicator assessments in nine countries: in Africa – Northern Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia; and in Asia – Nepal and Tajikistan.

Annex B provides the indicator values for the nine countries for which FTF FEEDBACK was responsible for the baseline assessment.

In Year 3, FTF FEEDBACK completed collection and analysis of data in the two countries where these tasks were not completed in Year 2 (Senegal and Mozambique), finalized the Country Reports for all nine countries, and provided USAID with public use datasets and documentation for those countries with USAID-approved baseline Country Reports. See Table 2-1.

Country Reports. The Country Reports for the nine countries contained the following tables and analyses:

1. ZOI total population
2. Agricultural output (e.g., yield, production, value)²
3. Feed the Future indicators and data sources
4. Required sample size for population-based indicators
5. Source of data for baseline indicators
6. ZOI population-based indicators
7. Household demographics
8. Highest education level within the household
9. Dwelling characteristics
10. Housing construction materials
11. Main source of cooking fuel
12. Households with improved water and sanitation facilities
13. Poverty and expenditure indicators
14. Prevalence of household hunger
15. Nutritional status of children under 5
16. Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months
17. Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)
18. Components of MAD among children 6-23 months
19. Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months³
20. Prevalence of mild, moderate, and severe anemia among children 6-59 months
21. Women's body mass index
22. Prevalence of underweight women
23. Prevalence of households with underweight women and stunting in children under 5
24. Prevalence of overweight and obese women
25. Prevalence of households with overweight/obese women and stunting in children under 5
26. Women's Dietary Diversity Score: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age
27. Percentage of women consuming each food group daily
28. Women's Dietary Diversity Score by quartile
29. Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age

² Agricultural data reported varied by country.

³ Data on anemia were not collected in Northern Kenya, Senegal and Zambia.

30. Prevalence of mild, moderate, and severe anemia among women of reproductive age
31. WEAI indicators
32. Women's Five Domains of Empowerment (5DE) subindex
33. Women's 5DE score and household type
34. Percent of women who are not yet empowered and who have inadequate achievement (censored headcount) in the 5DE indicators
35. Gender Parity Index (GPI)
36. Percent of men and women who are not yet empowered and have inadequate achievement (censored headcount) in the 10 5DE indicators
37. Severity of household hunger according to women's achievement of the 10 WEAI indicators
38. Values for selected indicators according to women's empowerment status
39. Selected indicators by category of decision-making index

Indicators related to children's nutritional status were disaggregated by the sex of the child. Other indicators were disaggregated by the gendered household type⁴ or pregnancy status of the woman.

Several USAID Missions requested collection and analysis of data on additional indicators. For example, USAID/Kenya wanted data related to resilience and USAID/Mozambique wanted data on use of mobile phones and mobile money. USAID Missions also had the opportunity to request additional analyses of the data related to the core indicators. In total, FTF FEEDBACK conducted 70 additional analyses in response to USAID Mission requests.

The Country Reports were carefully reviewed by the BFS Activity Manager and the USAID Mission. Standards to be used across all Country Reports emerged and were refined (then applied to previously drafted Country Reports) over the course of these reviews. Final reports for all countries were submitted and approved in Year 3⁵.

Delivery of Public Use Datasets. Under the terms of the Executive Order *Making Open and Machine Readable the New Default for Government Information* and the Administration's *Open Data Policy*, BFS will post the data from FTF FEEDBACK surveys, including the baseline performance monitoring surveys, on usaid.gov. The datasets will be available as open and machine-readable public use datasets after publication of the country reports.

An essential step in the preparation of FTF FEEDBACK datasets for public use is ensuring respondent privacy and confidentiality. Respondent privacy and confidentiality are protected by removing identifying information from the datasets, including *direct identifiers* (information such as names, addresses, Global Positioning System [GPS] coordinates, or any other personally identifying number or characteristic) and *indirect identifiers* (data that do not specifically identify a person or location, but that can be used to do so, one variable at a time or in combination, by uniquely describing a person or household). FTF FEEDBACK developed and implemented a Disclosure Analysis Plan (DAP) for each FTF FEEDBACK dataset from the baseline surveys to ensure privacy and confidentiality. Table 2-1 provides the dates that FTF FEEDBACK provided BFS with the public use datasets, codebook, and README files for the baseline surveys. Other

⁴ Gendered household types are: households with at least one male and one female adult; households with at least one female adult and no male adults; households with at least one male adult and no female adults; and households with children and no adults.

⁵ The 508-compliant versions of the baseline Country Reports for Senegal, Mozambique, and Tajikistan were not prepared by FTF FEEDBACK. BFS identified an alternate contractor to create the 508-compliant versions of the Country Reports. Posting to the DEC by FTF FEEDBACK is to take place after BFS has posted the reports to the usaid.gov website.

documentation, such as privacy statements were also submitted to BFS with the data and materials to be made publicly available.

Table 2-1. Baseline Survey Dataset Submission Dates

Country	Date public use dataset, codebook, README file submitted to BFS
Northern Kenya	5/19/2014
Malawi	3/20/2014
Mozambique	6/27/2014
Nepal	4/30/2014
Rwanda	5/9/2014
Senegal	5/30/2014
Tajikistan	6/24/2014
Uganda	4/17/2014
Zambia	4/7/2014

BFS will post these datasets on the usaid.gov website.

FTF FEEDBACK also developed a document for USAID that will be used well beyond the interim indicator assessments. As mentioned in Section 2.1, FTF FEEDBACK was responsible for preparing the datasets used for the baseline indicator assessments available for public use. FTF FEEDBACK developed a document *Management of Indirect Identifiers* that describes steps to protect data confidentiality. The Chief Data Officer of USAID reviewed and found the document to be excellent, and asked that it be posted as a resource on USAID’s internal Open Data site as a resource for other USAID operating units.

2.2 Providing Additional Analyses of Baseline Data

In addition to its work on the nine baseline performance monitoring indicator assessments described in Section 2.1, FTF FEEDBACK assisted BFS with three other tasks associated with the baseline: (1) analyzing WEAI indicators for Guatemala; (2) analyzing remittances data for Nepal; and (3) collecting, analyzing and reporting data related to use of improved agricultural technologies in Mission-focus districts (MFD) in Uganda. These are described below.

Analysis of WEAI Indicators for Guatemala. FTF FEEDBACK was asked to analyze the WEAI indicators for the Guatemala baseline indicator assessment and to prepare the WEAI report section for the Guatemala Country Report according to the template for the WEAI section in the FTF FEEDBACK baseline Country Reports. FTF FEEDBACK completed this analysis in January 2014, and provided the draft summary of findings in February 2014. FTF FEEDBACK also led a webinar on WEAI for USAID/Guatemala staff.

Nepal Remittances. Due to the pervasiveness of labor migration among Nepali households, USAID/Nepal asked FTF FEEDBACK to study the impact of remittances in the Nepal ZOI. FTF FEEDBACK evaluated the magnitude of remittances in the ZOI and conducted bivariate analyses of household remittances and household poverty and child nutrition. FTF FEEDBACK completed these analyses in May 2014, and submitted the report of findings in June 2014.

Uganda Mission-Focused District (MFD) Baseline Report. USAID/Uganda has developed a results-oriented Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) that focuses and coordinates development investments programmatically and geographically to meet the CDCS Development Objectives and overall goal. The Mission's development hypothesis anticipates greater or accelerated development in 19 MFD (all of which are in the Feed the Future ZOI), where projects across all CDCS program areas work together. To test this hypothesis, the Mission also identified six comparison districts intended to be similar to MFD except *not* having programs in all three Development Objectives working together.

FTF FEEDBACK collected and analyzed the MFD baseline survey, covering all MFD and comparison districts. Data collection took place from January to March 2013. Interviews occurred at a total of 7,001 households. The MFD baseline survey collected data at the district level. Five of the standard Feed the Future indicators, household characteristics, and percent of improved farming management technologies used by crop were collected and analyzed. Given the numerous revisions to the Uganda MFD report, completion of the new analyses and report revisions is anticipated in Quarter 2 of Year 4.

2.3 Support for Development of Global Report

Feed the Future sought to synthesize the results from the Feed the Future Baseline Performance Monitoring Indicator Assessments in a Global Report⁶. This Global Report documented baseline values for Feed the Future ZOI population-based indicators across countries, assess how baseline values vary across regions, and provide country profiles for the Feed the Future focus countries. The intended audience includes technical officers in the BFS, USAID Missions, Feed the Future implementing partners, and users of Agrilinks.

FTF FEEDBACK assisted in the development of the Global Report. FTF FEEDBACK:

- Worked with BFS to develop an expanded outline for the report and a template for the country profiles;
- Raised a number of questions regarding comparability of data and data presentation and resolved these with BFS;
- Developed at least two drafts of each of the 20 country profiles;
- Consolidated and reviewed the comparability of the baseline data from all countries in a spreadsheet with 65 worksheets;
- Developed the tables, bar charts, and radar charts used in the report; and
- Submitted a complete draft of the Global Report to BFS.
- BFS will complete the final version of the Global Report.

⁶ The assessment excluded data from Mali, where data had not been collected at the time the report was developed.

2.4 Develop Materials to Be Used for the Interim Indicator Assessments

As work on the baseline performance monitoring indicator assessment was wrapping up, BFS started preparing for the interim performance monitoring indicator assessment. FTF FEEDBACK assisted BFS with the tasks for the Feed the Future-wide interim assessments:

- FTF FEEDBACK prepared early drafts of the Feed the Future *Volume 11: Guidance on the Midterm Assessment of the Feed the Future Zone of Influence Population-Level Indicators*. The objective of this guidance is to support USAID Missions in planning for and conducting their interim assessments. Guidance is provided on which indicators to collect, selecting the data source for each indicator, determining the timing of data collection, determining sample size and the sample frame, selecting a survey implementer, developing a country data plan, and planning for data analysis.
- FTF FEEDBACK carefully reviewed the *Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators* to identify issues with question wording, response options, instructions, skip patterns, and other items to improve the instrument for use in the interim assessments. Working closely with the BFS Performance Monitoring Activity Manager, FTF FEEDBACK submitted eight drafts of the questionnaire. The final, approved version of the questionnaire was submitted on September 22, 2014. This questionnaire will be included as the *Volume 11a Core Questionnaire* to be adapted for use in all Feed the Future focus countries.

2.5 Launch the Interim Indicator Assessments

FTF FEEDBACK will manage the interim indicator assessments in seven countries: Northern Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia⁷. FTF FEEDBACK worked in Quarters 2 – 4 to prepare for these assessments and to launch activities in these countries.

2.5.1 Prepare for the Interim Indicator Assessments

The most pressing task on award of the FTF FEEDBACK contract was to conduct baseline performance monitoring surveys in eight countries⁸ so that values for the indicators could be entered in the FTFMS by January 31, 2013, which was 8 months after contract signature. The urgent need to plan, prepare for and conduct data collection and analysis in eight countries in a short time meant rushing key project start up activities, such as assessing stakeholder expectations, carefully developing templates, procedures and systems for the surveys, and forming cohesion of team members working for different organizations. To prepare for the interim indicator assessment, FTF FEEDBACK worked in Year 3 to develop templates, procedures and information systems that will promote consistency, quality, and efficiency across work in all countries for the interim assessments. These are summarized below.

Templates. FTF FEEDBACK developed the following templates for BFS's review and FTF FEEDBACK's use on the interim assessments:

⁷ FTF FEEDBACK will not collect data in Senegal and Tajikistan for the interim indicator assessments.

⁸ A ninth country, Nepal, was added late in Year 1.

- Country Data Plan (completed);
- Updated human subjects training and confidentiality agreement (completed);
- Interim ZOI Survey Protocol template (completed);
- Volume 11a Core Questionnaire (completed)
- Interviewer's Manual template (Draft 2 in process);
- Supervisor's and Quality Control Interviewer's Manual template (Draft 2 in process);
- Training materials (Draft 1 in process);
- Statistical Analysis Plan (Draft 1 in process);
- Country Report (Draft 1 in process); and
- Interim assessment work assignment (country-specific work assignments in process).

Additionally, FTF FEEDBACK developed templates that do not require BFS review and approval but that guide internal activities. These include:

- Survey schedule (completed);
- Survey subcontractor Requests for Proposals (completed); and
- National Statistical Office Requests for Proposals (completed).

Finalized templates are now in use by FTF FEEDBACK staff for the upcoming interim indicator assessments.

Information Systems. FTF FEEDBACK worked to improve the information systems used on the surveys as follows:

- Improving the Open Data Kit (ODK) data entry program (completed);
- Selecting the second stage of the sample (completed);
- Preloading household IDs (completed); and
- Case management (completed).

Procedures. FTF FEEDBACK carefully considered the requirements of fieldwork, FTF FEEDBACK headquarters support, and interactions between the survey subcontractor and FTF FEEDBACK. Based on this, FTF FEEDBACK further delineated roles and responsibilities for FTF FEEDBACK and survey subcontractor team members. Additional detail on roles is documented in internal standard operating procedures that address translating and pretesting the survey questionnaire; managing revisions to the questionnaire; developing the codebook; listing; tablet shipping; managing personally identifiable information; version control; budget monitoring; data cleaning; case management; data quality review in the cluster; quality control (QC) of deliverables; and data freeze.

Ethical Review. In addition, FTF FEEDBACK started the ethical review process for the interim assessments by submitting the draft protocol and questionnaire to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the prime contractor, Westat, for review.

2.5.2 Launch the Interim Indicator Assessments in Each Country

FTF FEEDBACK has initiated preparatory activities for all seven interim surveys. As proposed in the Country Data Plans, FTF FEEDBACK plans to begin fieldwork/data collection for each country as shown in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2. Projected timeline for fieldwork for the interim assessments in 2015

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov
Rwanda										
Uganda										
	Kenya									
			Nepal							
					Mozambique					
						Malawi				
									Zambia	

Early work on the surveys entails the following:

- The FTF FEEDBACK Country Lead visits the country to work with the USAID Mission and other stakeholders to plan the indicator assessment in close coordination with the BFS Activity Manager.
- Based on these meetings and guidance from the Volume 11 Guidance Document, the Country Lead develops a Country Data Plan that outlines the source of data for all indicators, the timing of data collection, the sample size, and plans for subcontracting for data collection.
- The Country Lead prepares the protocol and customizes the core survey instrument to meet the requirements for that country.
- FTF FEEDBACK issues a Request for Proposals to conduct data collection, and then reviews proposals, selects the best offeror, and negotiates a budget.
- FTF FEEDBACK orients the survey subcontractor to the FTF FEEDBACK questionnaire translation and questionnaire pretest protocols, and the survey subcontractor completes the translation and pretest.
- FTF FEEDBACK revises the Open Data Kit (ODK) data entry program to reflect the questionnaire as revised based on the pretest, and develops the foreign language versions of the ODK program.

Preparatory activities largely reflect this sequence of the surveys. Table 2-3 shows what early preparations were completed for each of the surveys as of Friday, October 3, 2014.

Table 2-3. Status of Preparatory Activities for the Interim Indicator Assessments (10/3/2014)

Activity	Rwanda	Uganda	Kenya	Nepal	Mozambique	Malawi	Zambia
Country Data Plan	Approved	Approved	Approved	In progress	Approved	With BFS	With BFS
Protocol and Survey Instrument	With BFS	With BFS	In progress	Not started	With BFS	In progress	In progress
Westat IRB	Pending	Approved	In draft	Not started	Pending	Not started	Not started
Subcontract	Awarded	Bids due 10/10	Bids due 10/10	Not started	Bids due 10/21	Not started	Not started
ODK Programs	In process	In test	Not started	Not started	Not started	Not started	Not started

3 IMPACT EVALUATION

BFS led the development of a Learning Agenda in the first half of 2011 in consultation with key stakeholders. The Feed the Future Learning Agenda is a set of key questions related to the causal linkages in the Feed the Future Results Framework. The impact evaluation component works to help address the questions identified in the Learning Agenda. It does this by conducting impact evaluations and by documenting the evidence base for what works in food security. Another objective of the impact evaluation component is to build capacity among USAID Missions, IPs, and others to understand, use, and conduct impact evaluations, and to collect data for use in impact evaluations.

3.1 Impact Evaluations

Impact evaluations are a critical piece of the Feed the Future strategy as they seek to establish whether and to what extent observed results can be attributed to Feed the Future interventions. Feed the Future-funded impact evaluations are to foster learning that will improve the effectiveness of Feed the Future interventions and other food security programs. They also help ensure Feed the Future's accountability to stakeholders.

Feed the Future is supporting a robust program of impact evaluations, many of which are being planned and conducted by FTF FEEDBACK. FTF FEEDBACK will use quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methodologies to generate high quality, credible evidence to answer research questions. Evaluations will use experimental or quasi-experimental designs to examine the impacts of Feed the Future interventions on beneficiaries.

3.1.1 Selection of Impact Evaluations

Prior to the start of FTF FEEDBACK, the BFS Feed the Future Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) team conducted an assessment of gaps in evidence related to the Learning Agenda as well as geographic gaps in the relevant evidence. The MEL team solicited two rounds of proposals for impact evaluations from USAID Missions and BFS. Early in Year 2, FTF FEEDBACK conducted a thorough review of these impact evaluation proposals. The team also reviewed projects in the FTFMS that appeared to have some potential for an impact evaluation. FTF FEEDBACK also assessed the feasibility of conducting an impact evaluation, taking into consideration the project's phase in the project cycle.

FTF FEEDBACK recommended projects to BFS for consideration for an impact evaluation. The review presented issues that would affect the quality of the recommended impact evaluations and identified key areas in which more information was needed. FTF FEEDBACK and BFS then worked together to learn more, where necessary, in order to select a solid and likely feasible slate of projects for evaluation. Based on this review, 20 impact evaluations were chosen.

Subsequently, the list of impact evaluations for FTF FEEDBACK was reduced. Some impact evaluations were dropped because based on the project implementation strategy it would not be possible to create a sufficiently rigorous impact evaluation design. Others were dropped when it was decided to move some activities to another contractor.

As of the end of Year 3, the FTF FEEDBACK team designed, or is in the process of developing a design for, the following impact evaluations:

1. Bangladesh/Integrated Value Chain;
2. Ethiopia/Pastoralist Resilience Improvement and Market Expansion (PRIME);
3. Haiti/Agriculture, Natural Resource Management;
4. Kenya/Resilience and Economic Growth in Arid Lands (REGAL);
5. Malawi/Integrating Nutrition into Value Chains;
6. Nepal/Business Literacy;
7. Niger/Food for Peace; and
8. Zambia/Gender and Groundnut Value Chain.

Work on three impact evaluations (Bangladesh, Nepal, and Niger) had been delayed due to procurement delays, but was started by the end of Year 3.

3.1.2 Study Design

The process of designing an impact evaluation follows a number of steps. First, the IE lead holds discussions with the USAID Mission in the study country and the implementing partner that carries out the project activities being evaluated. Then the IE lead and other FTF FEEDBACK technical staff persons, such as the food security specialist, visit the country to have more in-depth discussions about the project and possible research questions. More than one visit may be required for this purpose. As part of this process, the feasibility of an impact evaluation given each research question is assessed. Based on this assessment, the relevance to the FTF Learning Agenda, and the needs of the Mission, one or more research questions are selected for the evaluation. Once the research questions have been approved, the concept note will be written. The concept note is a brief document that discusses the research questions and the proposed evaluation design. In order to ensure the quality of the design, BFS and members of the Impact Evaluation Working Group (IEWG) will review and approve the concept note. After the concept note is approved, a proposal will be written that provides more detail about the impact evaluation, including the theory of change, research questions, sampling, quantitative and qualitative data collection, and analysis. Like the concept note, the protocol is reviewed and approved by BFS and the IEWG.

3.1.3 Study Implementation

Feed the Future impact evaluations collect both quantitative and qualitative data. The status of IE design and data collection for the FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluations at the end of Year 3 was as shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Status of FTF FEEDBACK IE Design and Data Collection (as of October 27, 2014)

Activity	Bangladesh Inte-	Ethiopia PRIME	Haiti Agricul- ture &	Kenya REGAL	Malawi Integrat- ing	Nepal Business Literacy	Niger Food for Peace	Zambia Gender and

	grated Value Chain		Natural Resource Management		Nutrition into Value Chains			Ground-nut Value Chain
Determine research question(s)	Not Started	Complete	Awaiting Approval	Complete	Complete	Not Started	Awaiting Approval	Complete
Design study	In Process	Complete	In Process	In Process	Complete	In Process	In Process	Complete
Develop protocol	Not Started	Complete	Not Started	In Process	Complete	Not Started	Not Started	Complete
Collect baseline quantitative data	Not Started	Baseline Complete	Not Started	Baseline Complete	Baseline Complete	Not Started	Not Started	Baseline Complete
Collect baseline qualitative data	Not Started	Baseline Complete	Not Started	Expected Yr 4 Qtr1	Expected Yr 4 Qtr1	Not Started	Not Started	Expected Yr 4 Qtr1

3.2 Impact Evaluation Capacity Building

FTF FEEDBACK seeks to build impact evaluation capacity of USAID Missions, IPs, and host country organizations. Capacity building for impact evaluations focuses on methods, design principles, and analytic techniques for impact evaluation (including qualitative methods) that will enable trainees to become better consumers and managers of evaluations. Capacity building also is conducted for the host country organizations that collect data. Capacity building for survey organizations addresses human subjects protection, administration of the questionnaire, use of tablets for data collection, quality control and supervision of field teams, and interviewing techniques.

While FTF FEEDBACK does not have the resources to conduct sustained, in-person training, capacity building features importantly in impact evaluations implemented by the project. FTF FEEDBACK's approach is essentially one of "learning-by-doing." Training/mentoring of interested stakeholders in the country focuses on methods for designing and conducting rigorous impact evaluations and collecting reliable survey data. In the future, presentations of impact evaluation results to stakeholders will include sufficient introduction to impact evaluation methodologies to facilitate understanding and interpretation of the findings. In Year 3, this included working closely with the data collection subcontractors on impact evaluation design and implementation in Zambia (Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute) and in Malawi (Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources).

For each IE, FTF FEEDBACK contracted a local organization to implement a surveys needed.. The training for this organization focuses primarily on methods for data collection. In Year 3, 4 study coordinators, 2 researchers, 1 qualitative specialist, 31 supervisors and 235 interviewers were trained in data collection.

Additionally, a four-hour training was done in Zambia for 17 USAID and implementing partner staff on the basics of impact evaluation in order to enable those trained to be better consumers of impact evaluations.

4 KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

4.1 Introduction

The knowledge management (KM) component directly support several of the FTF FEEDBACK project-wide goals, and desired impact of increasing use of evidence-based knowledge disseminated by FTF FEEDBACK to improve their approaches to project and program design. The KM team manages the knowledge generated by FTF FEEDBACK surveys, reports and impact evaluations.

In Year 3, the KM component work focused on nine milestones organized within four objectives in its work plan, which are outlined and summarized in the sections below.

4.2 Status of the KM Milestones/Activities

OBJECTIVE 1: Manage evidence-based knowledge to improve program design and facilitate replication/expansion of successful interventions.

- **Contributions to the Agrilinks Website:** The team made monthly updates to the activity pages on the site: All five components (PM, IE, DM, KM and CB) on “Our Work” section were updated (<http://agrilinks.org/activity/ftf-feedback-0>). (The scope of activity for the CB component changed in the third quarter of Year 3, and therefore this section will no longer be updated.) Charts/tables that show the status for all the milestones/activities for each component were updated. Besides updating the images in the rotator box, a few changes were made to improve its functionality. These changes provide more flexibility and allow the users to view the images in the rotator at their own pace. The speed of the rotator box was decreased so that the images changed at a slower pace. We updated the maps in the rotator box that show the countries implementing impact evaluation and population based surveys.
- **Update the FTF FEEDBACK KM Strategy:** During Year 3, the team updated the KM Strategy, which was released as Version 3.0.
- **Assessment of knowledge management-related products or needs as identified by BFS:** In Year 3, the team completed an assessment of the conditions and features of a webinar that make it most useful for training and knowledge transfer. A subcommittee comprising of members of the KMWG was developed in late March to conduct the assessment. The subcommittee provided guidance for developing the questionnaire for the assessment and combining the assessment with the Increasing Feed the Future Impacts through Targeted Gender Integration Webinar (<http://agrilinks.org/events/increasing-feed-future-impacts-through-targeted-gender-integration>), which was held on August 20, 2014.

The webinar assessment survey, consisting of 32 questions, was finalized in the first week of August and programmed on Survey Monkey. There were 100 attendees for the webinar and 42 members responded to the survey. The preliminary results of the assessment were presented to the KMWG members on September 10, 2014. Participants provided valuable input for improving future webinars.

- **Host Online Moderated Discussions:** The FTF FEEDBACK team launched online, moderated discussions, and the FTF FEEDBACK Group was launched in February 2014. The team hosted three online moderated discussions in Year 3. Each discussion topic has its own webpage and supporting resources. We posted a transcript for each discussion to the Resources section of Agrilinks.org following the session. The discussions were conducted around the following topics:
 - Feedback on using the FTFMS reporting system (February 11-12, 2014).
 - Discussion on the current learning and challenges of measuring resilience in food insecurity contexts (August 5-6, 2014).
 - FY14 FTFMS Guidance Review (September 23, 2014).
- **Blogging:** The KM team developed four blogs in Year 3 around the following topics:
 - Target Setting: Re-thinking the Bigger Picture in Uganda
 - Measuring Participant Learning at Feed the Future’s Webinars on the Agricultural Indicator Guide
 - Community Resilience: The Capacity for Collective Action
 - The Population-Based Survey (PBS) in Nepal (which focused on critical indicators in the areas of women’s and children’s nutrition, poverty and remittances from pervasive labor migration)

OBJECTIVE 2: Expand user access to FTF-FEEDBACK generated information, data and evidence on Agrilinks.

- **Improved Dashboards for Agrilinks:** The team created a working model of the new FTF-FEEDBACK Dashboard in Year 3. This dashboard was created in a Drupal environment so that it could, be integrated in the Agrilinks.org portal when needed. It will display the status of the implementation of FTF-FEEDBACK’s seven PBSs to be conducted between the fourth quarter of 2014 and the third quarter of 2015.
- **Interactive (user defined) Data Visualization on Agrilinks:** The KM team searched for existing Drupal modules which could be modified to better fit the project’s needs. Specifically, it would be optimal if Agrilinks.org members to be best use the FTF-FEEDBACK public release datasets on-line, similar to what users can do with the DHS datasets using STATcompiler (<http://statcompiler.com>). An extensive search revealed that there were no existing Drupal modules available or capable of performing as envisioned. Because the resources available do not permit FTF-FEEDBACK to develop this capability, we dropped this as an activity.

OBJECTIVE 3: Develop capacity-building tools and training materials and carry out specific training and capacity-building activities.

- **Methods and Instruments to measure performance against PMP targets (set for Year 4):** The team is preparing for this activity, which is due in Quarter 3 of Year 4. We will conduct surveys to report against KM’s PMP targets (due at the end of Year 4).
- **Develop and pretest the prospectus for the first of four KM orientations (to be conducted in PY4):** The KM team developed the prospectus for the first of four complementary KM orientations, and submitted to BFS in the form of a comprehensive, four part training curriculum titled “Feed the Future Feedback Project: Knowledge Management 101-4: Applying Knowledge.” The curriculum lists

the prerequisites, duration, material used, learning objectives, methods and detailed content or the first of the four orientations (KM101-4): Applying Knowledge.

OBJECTIVE 4: Assure logistics for Webinars

- **Assure logistics for all webinars identified in Year 3:** FTF FEEDBACK has allocated resources to facilitate up to 16 webinars in Year 3. The following webinars were conducted in this year.

Webinar	Dates
Community Resilience Measurement (http://agrilinks.org/library/community-resilience-development-conceptual-framework-and-measurement-webinar-recording)	March 4, 2014
Increasing Feed the Future Impacts through Targeted Gender Integration Webinar (http://agrilinks.org/events/increasing-feed-future-impacts-through-targeted-gender-integration)	August 20, 2014
FTF Indicator Guide Refresh (http://agrilinks.org/events/2014-feed-future-indicator-refresh-consultation)	September 10, 2014

There has been an increase in the participation rates for the webinars. The current Adobe Connect platform is not capable of accommodating more than 100 members. The webinar team is working with the vendor to purchase a 'burst packet' that will provide the capabilities for accommodating more than 100 members over the period of a year.

4.3 Summary of KM Activities and Accomplishments

By the end of Year 3, multiple KM activities were completed, the work on one activity was halted, and two will be carried over to Year 4. A summary of the activities as outlined above is as follows:

1. Contributions to the Agrilinks website – Completed
2. Updates to the KM Strategy – Completed
3. Assessment of knowledge management-related products identified by BFS – Completed
4. Host Online Moderated Discussions – Completed
5. Improved Dashboards for Agrilinks – In process
6. Assure logistics for all webinars – Completed
7. Methods and Instruments to measure performance against PMP targets – In process
8. Making PBS data sets public – Completed
9. Interactive (user defined) Data Visualization on Agrilinks – Activities halted

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Year 3 was a productive year for FTF FEEDBACK, revising procedures for upcoming surveys and applying lessons learned in producing work products for all project components. Year 3 was also eventful in the statement of work modification, which included the removal of project-wide capacity building, reducing the number and frequency of knowledge management activities, and the de-scoping of eight impact evaluations. FTF FEEDBACK developed a Management Plan for COR/CO approval, which is updated quarterly.

Performance Monitoring. FTF FEEDBACK was successful in completing the baseline assessments of performance indicators in nine countries. The team also helped BFS compile and document findings for all Feed the Future focus countries in a Global Report. Also, the team applied lessons learned from the baseline assessment to develop management processes and procedures to prepare for the launch of the interim zone of influence surveys in seven countries beginning in early 2015.

Impact Evaluation. During Year 3, the scope of the impact evaluations for the FTF FEEDBACK contract was reduced to eight. There were several delays to launching most, due to procurement issues at USAID. The team completed three design protocols, and work assignments were approved for three impact evaluations: Ethiopia PRIME, Malawi INVC, and Zambia Groundnut. Data collection took place for each of these in Year 3. Two other impact evaluations (Haiti Ag NRM and Niger FFP) have well-defined research questions, and two others (Bangladesh IVC and Nepal Business Literacy) are in the early stages of development. As second draft of the Ethiopia PRIME baseline report was submitted to USAID/BFS, and there are plans for a formal presentation in Year 4.

Knowledge Management. During Year 3, the knowledge management work focused on four key objectives toward the primary goal of increasing use of evidence-based knowledge disseminated by the team to improve approaches to program design. Agrilinks continues to be a primary vehicle for relaying the status of all milestones and activities for each project component. The team moderated on-line discussions and did blogging each quarter in Year 3. Knowledge management staff, in support of data management staff, tracked the preparation of public use data sets which FTF FEEDBACK provided access to USAID/BFS to publish on www.usaid.gov.

Annex A

FTF FEEDBACK Performance Management Plan – Achievements for Year 3

FTF FEEDBACK Performance Management Plan (PMP) Achievements for Year 3

1 Achievement of Performance Monitoring PMP Targets

Table 1-1 lists PMP indicators for the performance monitoring component applicable to Year 3. Following the table, we discuss progress in achieving each target.

Table 1-1 Indicators for the performance monitoring component to be reported in Year 3

ID No	Indicator	Method of Measurement	Target (revised target)	Actual	Assessment
1.D1	Number of surveys of population-based indicators in the zone of influence completed	Count	1	1	Met target
1.D8	Number of global reports on results trends for zones of influence in all FTF countries	Count & delivery date	1; 8/8/14 (6/27/14)	1	Met target

Indicator 1.D1 – Number of surveys of population-based indicators in the zone of influence completed. FTF FEEDBACK was responsible for completing the baseline ZOI survey in Tete Province in Mozambique during Year 3. Fieldwork in Tete Province took place from November 22, 2013 to January 3, 2014.

Indicator 1.D8 – Number of global reports on results trends for zones of influence in all FTF countries. FTF FEEDBACK worked with BFS to develop an expanded outline for the Global Report and a template for the country profiles. FTF FEEDBACK raised a number of important questions regarding comparability of data and data presentation and resolved these with the BFS Activity Manager (AM). FTF FEEDBACK developed at least two drafts of each of the 20 country profiles; consolidated and quality checked the data from all countries; developed the tables, bar charts, and radar charts used in the report; and submitted a complete draft of the Global Report on the deadline of June 27, 2014. On July 10, 2014, the COR decided that staff within BFS would finalize the Global Report on the baseline surveys themselves.

2 Achievement of Impact Evaluation PMP Targets

Table 2-1 lists achievement of PMP indicators for the impact evaluation component applicable to Year 3. Following the table, we discuss progress in achieving each target.

Table 2-1 Indicators for the impact evaluation component to be reported in Year 3

ID No	Indicator	Method of Measurement	Target (revised target)	Actual	Assessment
2.D5	Number of design protocols (including work plans) for impact evaluations submitted	Count & delivery date	6 (5); 9/30/14	1	Delayed
2.D6	Percentage of planned surveys for	Percent	100%	33%	Delayed

ID No	Indicator	Method of Measurement	Target (revised target)	Actual	Assessment
	impact evaluations for which data has been collected, cleaned, and archived				
2.D7	Number of IE baseline analyses submitted	Count & delivery date	1; 9/30/14	1	Target met
2.D13	Number of individuals who have received FTF FEEDBACK training on impact evaluation design and implementation	Count	30	0	Target not met
2.D14	Number of individuals who have received FTF FEEDBACK training or mentoring in impact evaluation data collection techniques	Count	120	273	Target exceeded

Indicator 2.D5 – Number of design protocols (including work plans) for impact evaluations submitted. In the PMP, two design protocols were to be submitted in Year 2 and the remaining six in Year 3. Three protocols were submitted in Year 2 (Ethiopia, Malawi and Zambia). This left five protocols to be submitted in Year 3. All of these have experienced delays. A protocol for the Kenya baseline data collection had been submitted, since this was part of the PBS baseline, but it was not clear at the time of the baseline if or how this IE would proceed. In the middle of Year 3 a decision was made to proceed with this IE. Research questions were proposed and approved, but a full protocol that would link the elements of this IE was not drafted in Year 3. Development of that protocol is currently underway. The protocol for the Haiti IE was delayed because final approval for the proposed research questions had not occurred by the end of Year 3. Protocols for the remaining three IEs (Niger, Bangladesh and Nepal) were delayed due to delays in project procurement and startup of the projects with activities being evaluated.

Indicator 2.D6 – Percentage of planned surveys for impact evaluations for which data has been collected, cleaned, and archived. Baseline data collection for three IEs was planned for Year 3. Of these, one (Ethiopia) had data collection start early enough in Year 3 for data collection, cleaning and archiving to be completed. Data collection for the other two IEs (Malawi and Zambia) was started but not completed in Year 3. The Malawi IE experienced delays in the finalization of the design, due to extended discussions about randomization with the organization that is implementing the activities that are being evaluated. This delay resulted in the protocol not being approved until Year 3 Quarter 2, which delayed all of the other activities needed to keep data collection on time. The protocol approval process, as well as the work assignment submission/approval process for the Zambia IE data collection took longer than expected, which delayed preparations for, and the start of data collection.

Indicator 2.D7 – Number of IE baseline analyses submitted. One baseline analysis was planned and completed in Year 3. This was for the Ethiopia PRIME impact evaluation.

Indicator 2.D13 – Number of individuals who have received FTF FEEDBACK training on impact evaluation design and implementation. Formal training on impact evaluation design and implementation was not conducted in association with the work on any of the impact evaluations. However, a four-hour training was done in Zambia for 17 USAID and implementing partner staff on the basics of impact evaluation in order to enable those trained to be better consumers of impact evaluations. Additionally, in Zambia, FTF FEEDBACK is working closely with the data collection subcontractor Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute (IAPRI) on impact evaluation design and implementation. Likewise, in Malawi, FTF FEEDBACK is working closely with the data collection subcontractor Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR) on impact evaluation design and implementation.

Indicator 2.D14 – Number of individuals who have received FTF FEEDBACK training or mentoring in impact evaluation data collection techniques. Training in data collection was conducted for staff of the in-country organizations that collected baseline data for the impact evaluations. Between the three impact evaluations with data collection in Year 3, 273 staff persons were trained in data collection techniques. Those trained included 4 study coordinators, 2 researchers, 1 qualitative specialist, 31 supervisors and 235 interviewers.

3 Achievement of Data Management PMP Targets

Table 3-1 lists achievement of PMP indicators for the data management component applicable to Year 3. Following the table, we discuss progress in achieving each target.

Table 3-1 Indicators for the data management component to be reported in Year 3

ID No	Indicator	Method of Measurement	Target	Actual	Assessment
3.D1	Number of data quality protocols for FTF FEEDBACK surveys submitted	Count	1	0	Late
3.D4b	All IE survey data accessible to client online	Count & delivery date	6; 9/30/14	0	Delayed
3.D5a	Selected PBS survey data made accessible online via www.USAID.gov]	Count & delivery date	9; 9/30/14	9	Met target
3.D10	Number of individuals who have received FTF FEEDBACK orientation in data quality assurance and data entry procedures for FTFMS	Count/Training record	60	0	Delayed at BFS request to early Year 4

Indicator 3.D1 – Number of data quality protocols for FTF FEEDBACK surveys submitted. A draft data quality protocol was submitted to BFS on December 31, 2013. BFS responded with comments on January 3, 2014.

During Year 3, the Data Quality Protocols underwent a major revision due to the development of additional quality control procedures regarding the quantitative data collection and cleaning process. The details of the original Data Quality Protocol submitted to BFS on December 31, 2013 are now documented in several procedural work instructions rather than a single document.

Indicator 3.D4b – All IE survey data accessible to client online. Baseline data were collected for three (rather than six) impact evaluations. These data have not yet been made available to USAID, but will be discussed with the COR early in Year 4. The concern is a possible compromise to the impact evaluation if those data were used to modify program implementation. FTF FEEDBACK proposes to revise the PMP so that data are only made available after the impact evaluation has been completed.

Indicator 3.D5a – Selected PBS survey data made accessible online via www.USAID.gov. FTF FEEDBACK does not have the ability to post PBS datasets on www.USAID.gov. Rather, FTF FEEDBACK provides BFS with the public use datasets and documentation and BFS posts the datasets on www.USAID.gov. Table 3-2 shows the dates by which FTF FEEDBACK made datasets and documentation available to BFS for posting on www.USAID.gov.

Table 3–2 Selected Baseline PBS survey data made available for posting online via www.USAID.gov

Country	Due date (Revised due date)	Date Submitted	Assessment
Kenya	5/31/13 (5/19/14)	5/19/14	On time
Malawi	3/20/14	3/20/14	On time
Mozambique	7/3/14	6/27/14	Early
Rwanda	5/9/14	5/9/14	On time
Senegal	6/2/14	5/30/14	Early
Uganda	5/31/13 (4/21/14)	4/17/14	Early
Zambia	5/31/13 (4/7/14)	4/7/14	On time
Nepal	5/31/13 (5/5/14)	4/30/14	Early
Tajikistan	5/31/13 (6/30/14)	6/24/14	Early

Indicator 3.D10 - Number of individuals who have received FTF FEEDBACK orientation in data quality assurance and data entry procedures for FTFMS. This orientation was rescheduled at BFS's request to October 7, which is after the timeframe of Year 3.

4 Achievement of Knowledge Management PMP Targets

Table 4-1 lists achievement of PMP indicators for the knowledge management component applicable to Year 3. Following the table, we discuss progress in achieving each target.

Table 4-1 Indicators for the knowledge management component to be reported in Year 3

ID No	Indicator	Method of Measurement	Target	Actual	Assessment
4.D2b	Assessment of other knowledge management-related products or needs as identified by BFS submitted	Count & delivery date	1; 10/30/14	1	On target

Indicator 4.D2b – Assessment of other knowledge management-related products or needs as identified by BFS submitted. This assessment was delayed until BFS could identify a webinar that was expected to have around 100 participants around which we would conduct the assessment. The webinar, *Feed the Future Impacts through Targeted Gender Integration*, was identified and held in Quarter 4 (August 20). The draft assessment was submitted in Quarter 4. The target date for the final report is October 31, 2014 (which is in Year 4).

5 Achievement of Project Administration PMP Targets

Table 5-1 lists achievement of PMP indicators for the project administration component applicable to Year 3. Following the table, we discuss progress in achieving each target.

Table 5-1 Indicators for the project administration component to be reported in Year 3

ID No	Indicator	Method of Measurement	Target	Actual	Assessment
5.D1	Annual Work Plans submitted and approved	Count & delivery date	1; 8/31/14	1	On target
5.D2	Percentage of new tasks with an approved work assignment submitted in advance of initiation of work	Percent	100%	100%	Met target
5.D4	Progress reports and PMP reviews (quarterly and annual) submitted	Count & delivery date	5; within 15 days of quarter's end	5	On target
5.D5	Financial reports (quarterly and annual) submitted	Count & delivery date	4; within 15 days of quarter's end	3	Delayed
5.D6	Work assignments submitted and approved	Count & delivery date	12; 9/30/14	12	On target
5.D7	[Operations] Management Plan updated and submitted	Count & delivery date	1; within 15 days of the year's end	1	On target

Indicator 5.D1 – Annual Work Plans submitted and approved. The Annual Work Plan for Year 4 was submitted on August 31, 2014, on schedule. The COR provided review comments on October 7, and the timeline for resubmission by FTF FEEDBACK is October 17, 2014.

Indicator 5.D2 – Percentage of new tasks with an approved work assignment submitted in advance of initiation of work. Any new tasks (meaning those not 'grandfathered' by the work assignment process) were initiated after a work assignment had been submitted to BFS and approved. (The exact number of tasks is not known at this writing: 6/30/2015.) In the case of the interim performance monitoring assessments, BFS has reviewed a work assignment template. Work on the interim performance monitoring assessments gets underway in advance of submission of the country-specific work assignment. The country-specific work assignment cannot be submitted until the data collection subcontractor has been selected since the work assignment includes data collection. FTF FEEDBACK is authorized by BFS to undertake the necessary preparatory work (inception visit, development of country data plan and protocol, customization of the questionnaire, selection of the data collection subcontractor) in advance of submission of the country-specific work assignment.

Indicator 5.D4 – Progress reports and PMP reviews (quarterly and annual) submitted. The Quarterly Progress Reports for Year 3 for all quarters were submitted within 15 days of the end of each quarter.

Indicator 5.D5 – Financial reports (quarterly and annual) submitted. Quarterly Financial Reports were submitted for Quarters 2 and 3 of Year 3. A Financial Report for Quarter 1 was not submitted, as agreed by the COR and ACOR. In lieu of the Financial Report for Quarter 1, FTF FEEDBACK revised all prior invoices at the request of the Contracting Officer. The Quarter 4 Financial Report includes a summary of expenditures for Year 3, as per FTF FEEDBACK contract requirements.

Indicator 5.D6 – Work assignments submitted and approved. There were numerous submissions of work assignments during Year 3, beginning in October 2013. Ten of the initial work assignments were revised and resubmitted at the request of the COR and CO. During Year 3, there were 17 unique work assignments submitted, as follows. Note that work assignments with an asterisk (*) were approved by BFS in Year 3.

1. General Management*

2. Project-wide IT and Data Management*
3. Knowledge Management*
4. FTFMS*
5. Capacity Building
6. Report Production
7. Impact Evaluation Working Group*
8. Knowledge Management Working Group*
9. Performance Monitoring Working Group*
10. Nepal Remittances*
11. Global Report*
12. Guatemala WEAI*
13. Ethiopia PRIME Impact Evaluation*
14. Zambia Impact Evaluation*
15. Malawi Impact Evaluation*
16. Uganda MFD
17. Kenya REGAL Impact Evaluation*

Work assignments cancelled were for the Capacity Building Working Group and Project Wide Capacity Building. Reports production tasks were scaled back, and are not to include 508-compliance related tasks after the baseline PBS reports. The FTF FEEDBACK team remains responsible for DEC postings for all survey reports to the end of the contract.

Indicator 5.D7 – [Operations] Management Plan updated and submitted. We revised the Management Plan, and submitted the revised plan to BFS on July 15, 2014. Updates to the Management Plan will continue to be submitted quarterly.

Annex B

Feed the Future Baseline Performance Monitoring Indicator Values for Focus Countries Reported on by FTF FEEDBACK

B.1 NORTHERN KENYA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	Arid lands of northern Kenya - The ZOI in northern Kenya is comprised of nine counties and approximately two-thirds of Kenya's total land area.
PBS Sample	1,760 households
Data Collection Partner	Ronto Research Company in collaboration with the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM	MNF
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP)	55.1	55.9 ^a	57.2 ^b	21.2 ^{ab}
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$)	\$1.99	\$1.81 ^c	\$1.89 ^d	\$6.99 ^{cd}
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%)	50.9	51.7 ^e	57.4 ^{ef}	31.2 ^f
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M	
Stunted children under 5 years (%)	29.4	26.3 ^g	32.5 ^g	
Wasted children under 5 years (%)	13.2	12.6	13.7	
Underweight children under 5 years (%)	19.7	17.1	22.2	
Underweight women of reproductive age (%)	–	31.2	–	
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9)	–	2.6	–	
Children 6–23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%)	5.1	5.2	5.0	
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%)	51.6	46.0	55.8	
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI	
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)	0.72	0.71	0.81	

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^{a-g} Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

Data Source: FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (January 2013).

B.2 MALAWI FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	Seven districts in the Central and Southern Regions: Mchinji, Lilongwe, Dedza, Ntcheu, Balaka, Machinga and Mangochi
PBS Sample	3,397 households
Data Collection Partner	Malawi National Statistical Office (NSO)

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM	MNF
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) ¹	60.6	59.6 ^a	72.0 ^a	27.2 ^a
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$) ¹	\$1.73	\$1.73 ^b	\$1.45 ^b	\$3.88 ^b
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%) ²	40.2	38.1 ^c	45.5 ^c	41.5
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M	
Stunted children under 5 years (%) ³	47.5	45.0	50.5	
Wasted children under 5 years (%) ³	5.8	5.7	6.0	
Underweight children under 5 years (%) ³	13.9	12.8	15.3	
Underweight women of reproductive age (%) ³	–	9.6	–	
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9) ²	–	3.4	–	
Children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%) ³	18.1	17.1	19.1	
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%) ³	68.2	67.5	68.9	
Anemia in women of reproductive age (%) ³	–	28.9	–	
Anemia in children 6-59 months (%) ³	64.3	65.0	63.4	
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI	
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index ² (WEAI)	0.84	0.83	0.91	

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^{a-c} Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

Data sources: ¹ Third Integrated Household Survey (IHS3) (March 2010 - March 2011); ² FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (November - December 2012);

³ Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) (June - September 2010).

B.3 NEPAL FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	20 districts across the western, mid-western and far-western development regions
PBS Sample	2,000 households
Data Collection Partner	New ERA

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM	MNF
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) ¹	32.5	32.7	32.8	14.4 [^]
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$) ¹	\$2.12	\$2.10	\$2.17	\$3.18
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%) ²	10.6	9.9	13.0	12.4
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M	
Stunted children under 5 years (%) ³	45.2	43.4	46.6	
Wasted children under 5 years (%) ³	12.0	10.5	13.2	
Underweight children under 5 years (%) ³	34.9	33.7	35.8	
Underweight women of reproductive age (%) ³	–	21.5	–	
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9) ²	–	3.9	–	
Children 6–23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%) ³	22.7	21.5	23.6	
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%) ³	71.1	74.4	68.4	
Anemia in women of reproductive age (%) ³	–	37.6	–	
Anemia in children 6-59 months (%) ³	49.8	54.3 ^a	46.1 ^a	
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI	
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index ² (WEAI)	0.80	0.79	0.89	

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^a Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

[^] Results not statistically representative; n<30.

Data sources: ¹Nepal Living Standards Survey (NLSS III) (2010-2011); ² FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (April - May 2013); ³ Nepal Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) (2011).

B.4 RWANDA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING SUMMARY

ZOI	27 of the 30 districts in Rwanda, with the exception of the three districts of Kigali City
PBS Sample	2,000 households
Data Collection Partner	Centre for Economic and Social Studies (CESS)

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM	MNF
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) ¹	67.0	66.9 ^a	71.5 ^a	37.3 ^a
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$) ¹	\$1.51	\$1.50 ^b	\$1.28 ^b	\$3.70 ^b
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%) ²	43.1	40.5 ^c	49.8 ^c	48.6
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M	
Stunted children under 5 years (%) ³	46.3	43.3 ^d	49.4 ^d	
Wasted children under 5 years (%) ³	2.7	2.2 ^e	3.1 ^e	
Underweight children under 5 years (%) ³	11.8	10.7	13.0	
Underweight women of reproductive age (%) ³	–	7.4	–	
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9) ²	–	3.3	–	
Children 6–23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%) ³	17.3	17.4	17.2	
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%) ³	86.5	89.0	83.8	
Anemia in women of reproductive age (%) ³	–	17.2	–	
Anemia in children 6-59 months (%) ³	38.1	34.7 ^f	41.6 ^f	
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI	
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index ² (WEAI)	0.91	0.90	0.96	

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^{a-f} Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

Data sources: ¹ Enquête Intégrale sur les Conditions de Vie des ménages/Round 3 (EICV3) (November 2010 - October 2011); ² FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (December 2012 - January 2013); ³ Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) (September 2010 - March 2011).

B.5 TAJIKISTAN FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	12 of 24 districts in Khatlon province
PBS Sample	2,000 households
Data Collection Partner	Centre for Sociological Research “Zerkalo”

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) ¹	8.8	8.7	9.8
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$) ¹	\$3.32	\$3.31	\$3.35
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%) ¹	13.9	13.4 ^a	19.5 ^a
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M
Stunted children under 5 years (%) ¹	30.7	29.7	31.8
Wasted children under 5 years (%) ¹	6.9	7.7	6.0
Underweight children under 5 years (%) ¹	10.1	11.0	9.1
Underweight women of reproductive age (%) ¹	–	6.1	–
Women’s dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9) ¹	–	4.4	–
Children 6–23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%) ¹	7.7	7.8	7.7
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%) ¹	38.5	40.8	36.0
WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI
Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index ¹ (WEAI)	0.69	0.68	0.79

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. MNF and CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^a Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

Data sources: ¹FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (December 2012 - January 2013); ²Micronutrient Status Survey (MSS) (October 2009).

B.6 UGANDA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	38 districts across eight regions
PBS Sample	2,566 households
Data Collection Partner	Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM	MNF
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) ¹	32.9	32.9	35.4	18.8
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$) ¹	\$1.53	\$1.51	\$1.42	\$2.78
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%) ²	26.7	26.4	29.2	24.6
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M	
Stunted children under 5 years (%) ²		33.0	29.8 ^a	36.2 ^a
Wasted children under 5 years (%) ²		6.0	6.2	5.8
Underweight children under 5 years (%) ²		13.5	12.4	14.5
Underweight women of reproductive age (%) ²		–	8.0	–
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9) ²		–	3.3	–
Children 6–23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%) ³		16.7	20.8 ^b	12.7 ^b
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%) ³		60.0	52.5 ^c	67.8 ^c
Anemia in women of reproductive age (%) ³		–	20.2	–
Anemia in children 6-59 months (%) ³		43.6	42.4	44.8
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI	
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index ² (WEAI)	0.86	0.85	0.92	

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^{a-c} Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

Data sources: ¹Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) (May 2009 – April 2010); ² FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (December 2012); ³ Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)(June – December 2011).

B.7 SENEGAL FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	12 regions in the Northern Senegal River Valley (SRV), the Southern Forest Zone (SFZ), and coastal and western departments
PBS Sample	2,109 households
Data Collection Partner	Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE)

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP)	33.6	34.3 ^a	14.1 ^a
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/day 2010 US\$)	\$2.29	\$2.27 ^b	\$2.96 ^b
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%)	27.5	28.1	18.3
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M
Stunted children under 5 years (%)	25.2	22.5 ^c	27.8 ^c
Wasted children under 5 years (%)	10.5	9.7	11.3
Underweight children under 5 years (%)	18.3	16.0 ^d	20.5 ^d
Underweight women of reproductive age (%)	–	22.3	–
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9)	–	4.3	–
Children 6–23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%)	8.2	9.9	6.7
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%)	48.0	47.1	49.0
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)	0.70	0.69	0.77

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. MNF and CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^{a-d} Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

Data Source: FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (December 2012 – January 2013).

B.8 ZAMBIA FEED THE FUTURE PERFORMANCE MONITORING BASELINE SUMMARY

ZOI	Five districts in the Eastern Province: Chipata, Katete, Lundazi, Nyimba and Petauke
PBS Sample	1,640 households
Data Collection Partner	Zambia Central Statistics Office (CSO) with technical assistance from the National Food and Nutrition Commission

POVERTY AND HUNGER	ALL	M&F	FNM	MNF
Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) ¹	79.8	79.3 ^a	86.0 ^a	59.9 ^a
Daily per capita expenditure (\$/Day 2010 USD) ¹	\$1.19	\$1.19 ^b	\$0.98 ^c	\$2.16 ^{bc}
Households with moderate or severe hunger (%) ²	23.2	21.5 ^d	31.0 ^d	32.6
NUTRITION	ALL	F	M	
Stunted children under 5 years (%) ²	45.5	40.8 ^e	51.2 ^e	
Wasted children under 5 years (%) ²	2.7	1.5 ^f	4.1 ^f	
Underweight children under 5 years (%) ²	13.3	9.6 ^g	17.7 ^g	
Underweight women of reproductive age (%) ²	–	6.3	–	
Women's dietary diversity score (mean number of food groups consumed out of 9) ²	–	4.0	–	
Children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (%) ²	16.2	17.7	14.6	
Exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months (%) ²	^	^	^	
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	WEAI	5DE	GPI	
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index ² (WEAI)	0.80	0.79	0.89	

M&F = at least one adult male and one adult female living in the household; FNM = at least one female but no male adults; MNF = at least one male but no female adults; CNA = no adults in the household. CNA household type not included because the sample size is not statistically representative (n<30).

^{a-g} Differences between subgroups with the same superscript are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Comparisons are between columns within each indicator.

^ Results not statistically representative; n<30.

Data sources: ¹Rural Agricultural Livelihoods Survey (RALS) (Apr 2011 -May 2012); ² FTF FEEDBACK baseline ZOI survey (November - December 2012).

Annex C

Summaries of Impact Evaluations Planned to Date

Introduction

Each impact evaluation within the FTF FEEDBACK project undertakes to study significant questions raised through specific Feed the Future implementing mechanisms, projects, activities, or other interventions as they operate in a focus country or across focus countries. To develop a useful impact evaluation requires, therefore, a sound grasp of the field reality of the Feed the Future intervention and a clear connection with issues significant for successful Feed the Future work and learning.

Most experts advise designing an evaluation while designing the intervention. Having plans for activity tracking, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), special studies, and impact evaluation in place before project launch facilitates a true pre-intervention baseline and systematic data collection over time that should be tailored to project stakeholders' information needs. Retrospective impact evaluation designs, while common, are not optimal.

In international development, however, interventions may be significantly reshaped after design, after launch, mid-course, or indeed at any stage. Alterations may occur to correct design flaws or address gaps, or as adaptive responses to changes in the host country, changes in the donor's budget, shifts in political will or exertion of influence, and many other factors – whether new elements or new understanding of the salience of elements that were there all along.

FTF FEEDBACK impact evaluations are being designed in collaboration across these many moving parts, with a broad range of stakeholders engaged to best inform planned questions, methods, and analysis. Each evaluation will thus produce a unique contribution to our understanding of the spectrum of important research questions in the area of food security. Each evaluation ties explicitly into the Feed the Future Learning Agenda, which is organized by six themes:

1. Agricultural productivity,
2. Research and development,
3. Markets and trade,
4. Nutrition and dietary diversity,
5. Gender and women's empowerment, and
6. Resilience of vulnerable populations.⁹

A range of specific questions emerge under each theme when examining any Feed the Future intervention. Impact evaluation teams must sift through the most useful learning opportunities to balance their pros and cons on dimensions of potential feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and rigor – within time and resource constraints. US and host country Institutional Review Boards must vet the study designs, and may require changes. And, as noted, in the meanwhile, the intervention itself may evolve according to new information or changed circumstances.

The following presents the status of current impact evaluation activities as they stand at the end of Year 3

⁹ <http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-future-learning-agenda> PDF file published 29 May 2012; accessed 14 October 2013.

Ethiopia: PRIME Impact Evaluation

The *Pastoralist Areas Resilience Improvement and Market Expansion* (PRIME) project operates in three pastoral clusters of Ethiopia (Southern, Somali, and Afar Clusters). PRIME aims to increase household income and improve climate change resilience and adaptive capacity. Main activities concentrate on climate change adaptation (including livelihoods diversification), pastoralism/livestock market linkages, and needs of food insecure and other chronically vulnerable households. Expected results include improved productivity and competitiveness in the livestock sector, increased diversification of vulnerable households' assets, and improved health service delivery and population HIV/AIDS awareness.

The IE proposes to assess two dimensions of change in two zones, the Jijiga Zone of the Somali Pastoral Cluster and the Borena Zone of the Southern Pastoral Cluster. The evaluation design will focus on livelihoods—the activities of the program intended to improve and expand access to markets and livestock diversity—in Jijiga, and on resilience—activities intended to strengthen natural resource management, safety nets, and institutions—in Borena.

Research questions of the impact evaluation align with Feed the Future Learning Agenda questions.¹⁰ Related to resilience, the specific questions from the Agenda are:

1. What interventions improve the ability of vulnerable households to withstand common and extreme shocks affecting their economic activities? In what ways?
2. What interventions strengthen the ability of vulnerable households to recover from common and extreme shocks?
3. To what extent do different interventions to promote market access generate the participation of poorer households?
4. What interventions on both the “Push” (social protection) and “Pull” (value chain deepening) sides improve the participation of the poor in value chain activities?

Additional related questions specific to the PRIME context include:

5. What are the relationships between household and community resilience?
6. Have interventions strengthened risk-reduction strategies pursued by men and women to cope with shocks?

Data collection in both zones include a mixed-methods (quantitative and qualitative) panel study of households and routine monitoring in a subset of households of environmental and other shocks that negatively affect food security. Data collection for the quantitative and qualitative baseline survey was conducted early in Year 3. The routine monitoring data collection will begin early in Year 4.

A baseline survey report was submitted to BFS for review and is in the process of finalization. In addition to descriptive analysis of resilience, this report has some initial multivariate analysis to get a more in-depth understanding of the factors that contribute to resilience. Due to the complex nature of resilience, some factors have been combined into a series of indices that measure different aspects of resilience.

¹⁰ <http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-future-learning-agenda> PDF file published 29 May 2012; accessed 14 October 2013.

Malawi: INVC Impact Evaluation

The *Integrating Nutrition in Value Chains* (INVC) project operates in Mchinji, Lilongwe, Dedza, Ntcheu, Balaka, Machinga and Mangochi. The goal of the INVC project is to advance food security and nutrition in farming households while reducing rural poverty through an agriculture-led, integrated economic growth, nutrition, and natural resource management strategy. The INVC project proposes investments in the value chains for legumes and dairy to move farmers from subsistence toward commercial agriculture production in seven target districts in the Central and Southern regions of Malawi. This agriculture focus, combined with interventions to improve household nutrition and health practices, is designed to increase food security, dietary diversity, and household nutrition in the two districts that are the focus of this impact evaluation: Lilongwe and Mchinji.

By design, the INVC project emphasizes the integration of agriculture and nutrition. Therefore, integration of agriculture and nutrition is the focus of this impact evaluation. The related Feed the Future Learning Agenda question addressed by this IE is whether integrating nutrition-related program interventions alongside agricultural value chain interventions will contribute to a greater reduction in malnutrition compared to stand-alone value chain programs. The interventions of particular interest include:

- Value Chain (VC) investments to increase legume productivity, marketing, and subsequently income for small and medium size landholders with land available for crop diversification.
- Nutrition strategies implemented through Community Care Groups to increase household food consumption and nutrition by improving knowledge and practices to assure diet diversity and appropriate care and feeding practices for pregnant and lactating women and children under five years of age. Additional screening and referrals for primary maternal and child health services and referrals for therapeutic feeding for children suffering from severe acute malnutrition (SAM) are also planned.

The main research question, as it relates to the Learning Agenda, is whether agriculture programs designed to increase farmer production and incomes through VC interventions when integrated with nutrition interventions are more effective in improving household nutrition outcomes compared to stand-alone agriculture value chain programs. This directly addresses the fourth dimension of the Learning Agenda, *Improved Nutrition and Dietary Quality*, specifically the first question, which states, “*What have been the impacts of different approaches linking Agriculture, Nutrition and Health (ANH) on dietary diversity and nutritional status (i.e. geographic co-location of programs, integration of interventions, what combination of A, N, and H)? Have programs to increase farmers’ incomes resulted in improved nutrition when not coupled with nutrition programming?*”

This research question will be answered through an experimental design where the nutrition intervention is randomly assigned among areas that receive the VC intervention. This experimental design is facilitated by the planned phased deployment of the nutrition intervention in Lilongwe and Mchinji. A random allocation of the nutrition intervention should provide treatment and comparison groups that are similar in all characteristics but the nutrition intervention, which should provide more robust and credible evaluation results.

Quantitative data collection for the baseline survey began late in Year 3 and will finish early in Year 4. Qualitative data collection will begin soon after the completion of the quantitative data collection.

Zambia: Upgrading Groundnut Value Chains and Changing Gender Role Impact Evaluation

Feed the Future Zambia aims to maximize positive impact on female farmers and ensure equitable benefits for men and women by ensuring women can participate in economic opportunities throughout the value chain; preventing women from being displaced from the value chains with increased commercialization; and ensuring farm technologies are appropriate for both men and women. The proposed evaluation will assess the effects of integrating gender interventions into value chain strengthening activities on women's decision processes and control of production, marketing, and income.

USAID/Zambia has two mechanisms of interest to this impact evaluation: the *Production, Finance & Technology Plus* (PROFIT+) project and the *Better Life Alliance* (BLA) project. PROFIT+ aims to: (1) improve smallholder productivity; (2) expand markets and trade; and (3) increase private sector investment in agriculture. PROFIT+ will achieve these objectives by adopting a value chain approach that increases productivity and efficiency along six value chains (maize, soybean, sunflower, groundnut, tomato, and onion) in the Eastern Province economic corridor. The groundnut value chain (GNVC) is the focus of this IE. The goal of BLA is to increase sustainable, market-led growth across the entire food production and market chain, resulting in improved food and income security for 40,000 households in selected areas of Eastern Province.

Both PROFIT+ and BLA have adopted a gender mainstreaming approach. PROFIT+ engages in ongoing gender analysis and will implement a wide range of activities aimed at: increasing women's access to and control of inputs and labor saving technology; addressing land rights issues; facilitating women's access to finance; facilitating women's ability to participate in regional export market trade; promoting rural enterprise and cooperative development through gender sensitization linked to technical support; and promoting opportunities for value addition. BLA addresses gender through two main strategies. First, it engages female farmers as basic program beneficiaries and as lead farmers who coordinate beneficiary groups and demonstrate conservation farming techniques on their farmland. Second, beneficiary group education sessions discuss household budgeting and family planning, BLA requires that partners attend along with beneficiaries; in these sessions, BLA promotes joint household decision-making on the topics.

This impact evaluation directly addresses the Feed the Future Learning Agenda Area V: Improved Gender Integration and Women's Empowerment. Specifically, it addresses questions related to the impact of Feed the Future interventions on women's empowerment and is relevant to the following Key Questions:

1. Have agriculture productivity interventions reduced gender gaps in use of production inputs?
2. Have agriculture and nutrition projects or approaches effectively improved women's empowerment, specifically in terms of agricultural production, decision-making over and access to credit, control over income, leadership in the community, and time use?

Research questions for this impact evaluation focus on gender integration for the production and marketing components of the groundnut value chain. The specific research questions are:

1. Do women maintain control of production of groundnuts as commercialization efforts are expanded?
2. What interventions might assist in maintaining women's control over production of groundnuts.
3. Do women maintain control over marketing of groundnuts and control over proceeds as commercialization efforts are expanded?

1. What interventions assist in maintaining women's control over marketing of groundnuts and control over the proceeds.

Quantitative data collection for the baseline survey began late in Year 3 and was completed early in Year 4. Preparations for qualitative data collection are underway and data collection will begin soon.

Bangladesh: Integrated Value Chain Impact Evaluation

The *Agricultural Value Chain* (AVC) project in Bangladesh seeks to increase food security by applying a market systems approach to increase income at the household level. Due to the early stage of the project, the specific value chains had not been chosen by the end of FTF FEEDBACK Year 3. Despite this, an initial visit was made to Bangladesh to begin working with USAID and the implementing partner to define the aims of this impact evaluation. The research questions and design of the evaluation will be defined once value chains have been selected and project activities have been defined.

Haiti: FTF North Impact Evaluation

The impact evaluation is focused on evaluating a Feed the Future activity in the Northern region of Haiti. At this point, the specific aim of the evaluation must be determined in order for the design to proceed. Various research questions have been proposed and assessed for feasibility. Two remain of interest.

1. Compared with no intervention, what impact does the substitution of non-erosive hillside agricultural practices for erosive agricultural practices have on the value of the plot's agricultural production, and, in turn, the amount of agricultural income accruing to the hillside households over the life of the project?
2. Compared with no intervention, and with the substitution of non-erosive crops alone, what is the combined impact of the substitution of non-erosive crops AND installation of conservation structures on the value of the plot's agricultural production, and, in turn, the amount of agricultural income accruing to the hillside household?

Kenya: REGAL North Impact Evaluation

The goal of the *Resilience and Economic Growth in the Arid Lands* (REGAL) project is to increase economic growth by building a more inclusive and competitive livestock value chain. The project has two components: REGAL Accelerated Growth (REGAL-AG) and REGAL Improved Resilience (REGAL-IR). REGAL-AG builds on the efforts of REGAL-IR and on WFP investments in social and economic resilience by facilitating behavior change among all actors in the livestock value chain, in order to increase income.

The objective of this impact evaluation is to test the efficacy of the innovative, layered REGAL programming model in achieving intended resilience and economic growth results, as well as the additive/multiplicative gains associated with each layer. For comparative purposes, two strata are envisioned; REGAL-IR only (Turkana, and Isiolo counties) and REGAL- IR/AG (Marsabit county). A third 'control group' strata will be comprised of the remaining arid lands counties (Baringo, Samburu, and Tana River counties) where only WFP FFA activities exist.

This impact evaluation will investigate what REGAL activities strengthen the resilience of food insecure and vulnerable households in the project areas. Value chain investment in livestock markets with lower risk and lower entry barriers is one way of encouraging the participation of poorer rural households in expanding economic activities. The analysis will examine the project resilience impact on both the food insecure and vulnerable, as well as the food secure and non-poor.

Research questions for the qualitative component of the survey include:

1. *What impact do* resilience investments (REGAL-IR) have on livelihood outcome indicators (Household Hunger Scale, as well as stunting, wasting, underweight, poverty prevalence, and income)? What impact do they have on adaptive capacity?
2. What impact do growth investments (REGAL-AG) have on livelihood outcome indicators (Household Hunger Scale, as well as stunting, wasting, underweight, poverty prevalence and income)? What impact do they have on adaptive capacity?
3. What is the additive/multiplicative value of layering resilience (REGAL-IR) and economic growth (REGAL-AG) investments in relation to the indicators noted above?
4. What is the separate and combined impact of REGAL-IR and REGAL-AG on depth of poverty (derived from expenditure data used to determine poverty prevalence) and other well-being outcomes?
5. What are the relationships between household and community resilience (derived from the qualitative data)?
6. Have interventions strengthened risk-reduction strategies pursued by men and women to cope with shocks (agro-climatic, health, economic, and socio-political)?

Nepal: Business Literacy Impact Evaluation

The *Business Literacy Project* (BLP) in Nepal aims to increase resilience through improvements in entrepreneurial skills, literacy and numeracy, combined with education on agriculture. BLP has a focus on marginalized groups including women, youth, disadvantaged castes and ethnic minorities. Through an initial visit to Nepal, FTF FEEDBACK has begun the process of understanding the project and its activities in order to formulate research questions and establish a research design. The general theme of the evaluation will be to determine how BLP activities increase resilience, as well as adoption of agriculture and nutrition technologies and practices, in households served by this project.

Niger: Food for Peace Impact Evaluation

The impact evaluation in Niger aims to provide insights into how the resilience capacities of communities affect the impact of program interventions on the resilience capacities of households and individuals. In particular, the hypothesis is that different combinations of interventions will have differential impacts on household and individual resilience capacities, depending on the resilience capacities of the communities in which households and individuals are located.

Three general research questions are proposed for this impact evaluation:

1. Do the interventions that most effectively enhance household resilience capacities differ if the resilience capacities of the communities where they are located differ?
2. What are the specific aspects of community resilience capacities that most strongly support household absorptive and adaptive capacities, and resilience outcomes?
3. What are the combinations of interventions that most effectively enhance these key community resilience capacities?